REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 5, 16-21 and 26 have been amended by this Response. Claims 5, 16-17 and 20-21 have been amended for readability. New claims 30-33 have been added herein. Claims 8-9 and 15 have been previously cancelled. Claims 1-7, 10-14, and 16-33 are currently pending in this application, and are at issue herein.

Claim Rejections - § 103(a)

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 10-20, 23-24 and 26-29 stand rejected under § 103(a) as obvious over WIPO Publication No. WO 01/44918 to Evans et al. ("Evans") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,034,687 to Taylor et al. ("Taylor"). Claim 2 stands rejected under § 103(a) as obvious over Evans in view of Taylor and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0011639 to Webb ("Webb"). Claims 6, 21-22 and 25 stand rejected under § 103(a) as obvious over Evans in view of Taylor and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0051017 to Wishoff ("Wishoff"). Applicant respectfully traverses the claim rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 1, 18-19 and 26 have been amended to recite that the notification object maintains its position relative to the target object even if the target object is moved. In other words, the position of the notification object is anchored to that of the target object so that the notification object continues to point to its target object even if that target object is moved. None of the art cited in the Office Action discloses or suggests this limitation.

Evans, which is the main reference cited in the Office Action, discloses an error balloon 118 with error information 116 that is displayed upon the occurrence of an error event. For example, as shown in Fig. 2 of Evans, the error balloon 118 points to a user input area 110,

thereby relaying information to the user about which field was in error. However, Evans is devoid of any disclosure or suggestion of its error balloon 118 maintaining its position relative to the user input area 110 (*i.e.*, the target object) if that area is moved. Evans does not discuss moving the user input area 110, or any other area, and therefore is devoid of any disclosure or suggestion of what happens to the error balloon 118 should that occur. Fig. 2 of Evans is simply an illustrative representation of error information, and is not an illustration of a computer screen. As such, Evans does not disclose or suggest that its error balloon 118 (*i.e.*, the notification object) maintains its position relative to the user input area 110 (*i.e.*, the target object) even if the user input area 110 is moved. Evans simply discloses that its error balloon 118 points to the field where the error occurred, and is totally silent on relative positioning and/or movement of either the field with the error or the error balloon.

Taylor is also silent on the relative positioning between a notification object and a target object. The Office Action cites Figs. 9F(a) and (b) of Taylor as illustrating the notification message box capable of being minimized. However, as shown in Figs. 9F(a) and (b), the notification message of Taylor does not point to any type of area where an error occurred, but rather simply informs the user that he/she typed the wrong password. The user must click the "ok" button to presumably be taken back to a screen where a password can be entered to open a mailbox. In short, Taylor does not disclose any type of spatial relationship between a notification object and a target object, as recited in the independent claims of the present application.

Webb has been cited in the Office Action as disclosing a non-modal dialogue box which may also include text or a message (*e.g.*, an alert warning or error message) to a user 114. Webb is devoid of any disclosure or suggestion of a notification object maintaining its position relative

to a target object even if the target object is moved, as recited in the independent claims of the present application.

Wishoff is cited in the Office Action as disclosing using small animations to notify users of events or conditions. Similarly, Wishoff is devoid of any disclosure or suggestion of a notification object maintaining its position relative to a target object even if the target object is moved, as recited in the independent claims of the present application.

Accordingly, for at least the above-identified reasons, independent claims 1, 18-19 and 26 are believed allowable over the prior art of record. None of the cited art, taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests all of the claimed elements.

Claims 2-7, 10-14, 16-17, 20-25 and 27-33 depend cognately from independent claims 1, 18-19 and 26, and add features which further remove the present invention from the prior art. Given at least the distinctions identified above, the dependent claims are believed allowable over the prior art and a separate discussion of the dependent claims will not be belabored for the sake of brevity.

Conclusion

Applicant's invention is a novel system and method for producing user interface information messages in the form of a notification object, where the notification object maintains its position relative to the target object even if the target object is moved. None of the cited art, taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests Applicant's claimed invention. Accordingly, for at least the above-identified reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1-7, 10-14 and 16-33 are allowable over the prior art. Early notification to that effect is respectfully requested.

It is believed that this Response requires an extra claims fee of $150.00 for three dependent claims. Enclosed is a check for $150.00 to cover the extra claims fee. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any underpayment and credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-4553.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 8-4-2005

Bryan H. Opalko
Registration No. 40,751

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC
20th Floor, One Oxford Centre
301 Grant Street
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219-1410
Phone: 412-562-1893
Fax: 412-562-1041
e-mail: opalkobh@bipc.com
Attorneys for Applicant(s)